



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1459  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/120,153	04/09/2002	Manish Goyal	003797.00234	9364

28319 7590 02/24/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,  
 ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT  
 1001 G STREET, N.W.  
 ELEVENTH STREET  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

RECEIVED

FEB 28 2005

BANNER WITCOFF

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Best Available Copy

1/17 Docketed 2/28/05  
 Attny GDF/TCE/USA  
 Case Ref 003797.00234  
 Action Resp 3mm OA  
 Due Date 5/24/05  
 Last Day 6/24/05  
 By [Signature]

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/120,153		<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOYAL ET AL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Peter J Smith		<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2002.

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Best Available Copy

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/17/2003.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 2

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 4/9/2002, IDS filed 11/17/2003.
2. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 15, 19, and 25 are independent claims.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are directed towards methods for displaying, correcting, or rejecting text and a user interface for displaying text that has been recognized from input data. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. The preamble of each of the independent methods is directed towards text that has been "recognized from input data" either correctly or incorrectly. The limitation of the user interface in independent claim 19 requires "displaying text recognized from input data". The term "input data" does not require that the data is in a computer readable format. Therefore, one interpretation of this term reads upon a sheet of paper with data written or printed on it. Under this interpretation, recognizing the input data reads upon an interpretation of a person reading the sheet of paper. Thus, the

## Best Available Copy

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 3

Art Unit: 2176

claims read upon a mental process, whereby a person may perform the displaying, correcting, or rejecting of the text using a pencil and paper.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14, 19-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Golding, US 5,659,771 patented 8/19/1997.

Regarding independent claim 1, Golding discloses determining a confidence level in the correctness of text in fig. 3, the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. The probability determined by Golding indicates the confidence of the correctness. Golding discloses displaying the text according to the confidence level determined for the text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Golding discloses correcting recognized text according to the confidence level determined for the text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Golding discloses correcting recognized text by providing a menu with a list of alternate text choices in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 4

Regarding dependent claim 5, Golding discloses determining whether the correctness of the text has a high level of confidence or a low level of confidence in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. The probability determined by Golding indicates the confidence of the correctness.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Golding discloses determining whether the correctness of the text has a confidence level selected from the group of: a high level of confidence, a medium level of confidence, and a low level of confidence in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. The probability determined by Golding is one of the group consisting of high, medium, or low confidence.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Golding discloses determining whether the correctness of the text has confidence level selected from the group of four or more different confidence levels in abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Golding discloses displaying the input data in col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding independent claim 9, Golding discloses determining a confidence level in a correctness of text in fig. 3, the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. The probability determined by Golding indicates the confidence of the correctness. Golding discloses providing a correction process for correcting the text according to the confidence level assigned to the text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Golding discloses providing a first correction process to correct the text if the confidence level is equal to or above a threshold value, and providing a

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 5

second correction process to correct the text if the confidence level is below the threshold value in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Golding discloses correcting recognized text according to the first correction process by providing a menu with a list of alternate text choices in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Golding discloses determining the confidence level in the correctness of the text from among a group of confidence levels consisting of: a high confidence level, a medium confidence level, and a low confidence level in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. The probability determined by Golding is one of the group consisting of high, medium, or low confidence.

Regarding independent claim 19, Golding discloses a recognized text portion for displaying text recognized from input data according to a confidence level for a correctness estimate of the text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Golding discloses displaying text having a correctness estimate with a confidence level equal to or above a threshold value in a first manner and displaying text having a correctness estimate with a confidence level below the threshold value is displayed in a second manner in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Golding discloses a text correction portion for correcting incorrectly recognized text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Golding discloses wherein the text correction portion includes a menu of alternate text choices in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 6

Regarding dependent claim 24, Golding discloses an input display portion for displaying the input data corresponding to the recognized text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4, 12-13, and 15-18, 23, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golding, US 5,659,771 patented 8/19/1997 in view of Bricklin et al (hereinafter "Bricklin"), US 5,717,939 patented 2/10/1998.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Golding does not teach correcting recognized text by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text. Golding discloses text correction, but does not specifically discuss how the text is entered. Bricklin does teach correcting recognized text by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input resubmission taught by Bricklin to have improved Golding so that a new word would have been obtained from the user in the event that none of the suggested corrections made by Golding were accepted by the user.

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 7

Regarding dependent claim 12, Golding does not teach correcting recognized text according to a correction process by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text. Golding discloses text correction, but does not specifically discuss how the text is entered. Bricklin does teach correcting recognized text according to a correction process by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input resubmission taught by Bricklin to have improved Golding so that a new word would have been obtained from the user in the event that none of the suggested corrections made by Golding were accepted by the user.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Golding teaches a correction process of providing a menu of alternate text choices in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. Bricklin teaches both text resubmission and text abandonment correction processes to enable a user to correct incorrect text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have enabled three possible correction processes to have corrected the text.

Regarding independent claim 15, Golding teaches determining a confidence levels for the text based upon the correctness estimate of the text and rejecting the text if the determined confidence level is below a threshold value in fig. 3, the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. Golding does not teach employing a plurality of recognition processes to recognize

**Best Available Copy**



Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 8

Art Unit: 2176

input data as text or determining, for each recognition process, an estimate for a correctness of the text. Golding discloses text correction, but does not specifically discuss how the text is entered. Bricklin does teach employing a plurality of recognition processes to recognize input data as text and determining, for each recognition process, an estimate for a correctness of the text in col. 18 line 24 – col. 19 line 48.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input recognition processes of Bricklin to have provided a set of text which would have been corrected using the confidence probability correction teachings of Golding. The combination would have enabled the user to have actively entered or reentered text if the text was input incorrectly.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Golding teaches displaying the rejected text so as to uniquely identify the rejected text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Golding teaches determining the correctness estimate for the text using a neural network in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. Golding uses a Bayesian neural network to determine the correctness confidence probabilities.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Golding does not teach wherein the text recognition processes are independent from the other recognition processes. Golding discusses correcting the text after it has been recognized successfully. Bricklin teaches wherein the text recognition processes are independent from the other recognition processes in col. 18 line 24 – col. 19 line 48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention so that the

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 9

Art Unit: 2176

text recognition success rate would have been higher as Bricklin teaches is the advantage of using independent recognition processes in col. 18 line 24 – col. 19 line 48.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Golding does not teach wherein the text correction portion includes a prompt for a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the incorrectly recognized text. Bricklin does teach wherein the text correction portion includes a prompt for a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the incorrectly recognized text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input resubmission taught by Bricklin to have improved Golding so that a new word would have been obtained from the user in the event that none of the suggested corrections made by Golding were accepted by the user.

Regarding independent claim 25, Golding teaches a confidence level assignor module that assigns a confidence level in a correctness of the text recognized from the input data and a user interface that displays recognized text for correction according to the confidence level assigned to the recognized text in fig. 3, the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44. Golding does not teach a text recognition module that recognizes input data as text. Bricklin does teach a text recognition module that recognizes input data as text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input recognition as taught by

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 10

Art Unit: 2176

Bricklin to have improved Golding so that text would have been obtained from the user so that text would have been provided to have been checked for correctness using the teachings of Golding.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Golding teaches displaying text having a correctness estimate with a confidence level equal to or above a threshold value in a first manner and displaying text having a correctness estimate with a confidence level below the threshold value is displayed in a second manner in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Golding teaches an input data display portion for displaying the input data corresponding to the recognized text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Golding teaches a text correction portion for correcting incorrectly recognized text in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Golding teaches wherein the text correction portion includes a menu of alternate text choices in the abstract, col. 5 lines 12-35, and col. 8 lines 40-44.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Golding does not teach correcting recognized text by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text. Golding discloses text correction, but does not specifically discuss how the text is entered. Bricklin does teach correcting recognized text by prompting a user to resubmit input data corresponding to the recognized text in col. 3 lines 35-38, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 26 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bricklin into Golding to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text input resubmission taught by Bricklin to have

**Best Available Copy**

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 11

Art Unit: 2176

improved Golding so that a new word would have been obtained from the user in the event that none of the suggested corrections made by Golding were accepted by the user.

### *Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gross et al., US 6,782,510 B1 filed 1/27/1998 discloses a word checking tool that checks substance and not just spelling so that unintentional errors are not introduced into an electronic text document. Arning, US 5,715,469 patented 2/3/1998 discloses checking error strings in a text. Hamamura, US 6,847,734 B2 filed 1/26/2001 discloses a word recognition method. Goldberg, US 6,205,261 B1 filed 2/5/1998 discloses correcting misrecognized words using a confusion set. Goldberg, US 6,154,579 filed 8/11/1997 discloses correcting misrecognized words using a confusion set. Golding et al., US 5,956,739 patented 9/21/1999 discloses correcting users' mistakes including context-sensitive spelling errors. Seybold, US 5,787,455 patented 7/28/1998 discloses correcting recognized words. Roth, US 5,907,839 patented 5/25/1999 discloses context sensitive spelling correction.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

## Best Available Copy



Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0531-0031  
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it carries a valid OMB control number.

Substitute for <b>USPTO</b> <b>INFORMATION DISCLOSURE</b> <b>STATEMENT BY APPLICANT</b> (use as many sheets as necessary)		Complete if Known Application Number: 10/120,153 Filing Date: April 9, 2002 First Named Inventor: Manish Goyal et al. Group Art Unit: 2173 Examiner Name: John W. Cabaco Attorney/Doctel Number: 003787.00234	
Sheet		of	

**RECEIVED**  
 NOV 18 2003  
 Technology Center 2100

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
Examiner Initials *	Cite No.	Document Number	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patent or Applicant of Cited Document	Pages, Columns, Lines, Which Relevant Passages or Figures Appear
		Number - Kind Code <sup>2</sup> (if known)			
PJS		6,517,578	05-14-1999	Altman et al.	
PJS		6,690,267	12-31-1999	Forster	
ALL		6,253,783 B1	08-04-2001	Belagarda et al.	

OTHER PRIOR ART - NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS			
Examiner Initials *	Cite No.	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume- issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	T <sup>2</sup>
PJS		Nicholas Beran, "Rough Gems: First Pen Systems Show Promise, Lack Refinement," BYTE, April 1992, pp. 213-222	
PJS		R. Zhao et al., "Pen-based Interfaces in Engineering Environments," <i>Symposium of Human and Artifact</i> , Elsevier Science B.V., 1995, pp. 531-539	
PJS		C.G. Loocham, "Historical Perspectives of Handwriting Recognition Systems," <i>IEEE</i> , 1994, pp. 1-3	
PJS		Bernard Suhm et al., "Multimodal Error Correction for Speech User Interfaces	
PJS		Bernard Suhm et al., "Model-based and Empirical Evaluation of Multimodal Interactive Error Correction," <i>ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction</i> , May 1999, pp. 584-601	
PJS		Karen Kulkah, "Techniques for Automatically Correcting Words in Text," <i>ACM Computing Surveys</i> , Vol. 24, No. 4, December 1992, pp. 377-439	
PJS		Michael A. Grasso et al., "The Integrality of Speech in Multimodal Interfaces," <i>ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction</i> , Vol. 5, No. 4, December 1998, pp. 303-325	
PJS		Zouhair Trabek et al., "A Voice and Ink XML Multimodal Architecture for Mobile e-Commerce System," <i>ACM</i> , September 2002, pp. 100-104	
PJS		Hirohazu Bando et al., "User Interfaces for Correcting Errors in Writing-on-free Recognition of Handwritten Text," <i>Department of Computer, Information and Communication Sciences, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology</i> , Vol. 43, No. 6, June 2002, pp. 1998-2005	

Examiner Signature	<i>Peter J. Smith</i>	Date Considered	2/16/2005
-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-----------

\*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 608. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

<sup>1</sup> Unique citation designation number (optional). <sup>2</sup> Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 2.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Best Available Copy

Application/Control Number: 10/120,153

Page 12

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS  
2/18/2005

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Best Available Copy

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>	Application/Control No. 10/120,153	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination GOYAL ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter J Smith	Art Unit 2178	Page 1 of 1

## U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,659,771	08-1997	Golding, Andrew R.	715/533
	B	US-5,717,939	02-1998	Bricklin et al.	715/603
	C	US-6,782,510	08-2004	Gross et al.	715/533
	D	US-5,715,469	02-1998	Aming, Andreas	715/533
	E	US-6,847,734	01-2005	Hamamura, Tomoyuki	382/229
	F	US-6,205,261	03-2001	Goldberg, Randy G.	382/310
	G	US-6,154,579	11-2000	Goldberg, Randy G.	382/310
	H	US-5,956,739	09-1999	Golding et al.	715/533
	I	US-5,787,455	07-1998	Seybold, John Lorne Campbell	711/100
	J	US-5,907,839	05-1999	Roth, Don	707/5
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

## FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

## NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)  
 Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
 PTO-892 (Rev. 01-2001)

Notice of References Cited

Part of Paper No. 20050216

Best Available Copy